UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,607	03/18/2002	Edgar Vicente Chiquin		7668

7590 04/16/2008

Edgar Chiquin
800 POLO CLUB DRIVE
AUSTIN, TX 78749

EXAMINER	
MONTOYA, OSCHTA I	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/16/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/098,607	CHIQUIN, EDGAR VICENTE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OSCHTA MONTOYA	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is not numbered. On page 4, lines 19 to 23, there is a claim that is not numbered. It should read claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7, 9-11, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, US 6,619,605 in view of Haken, US 2004/0008972 in view of Lewis, US 2003/0040962 in view of Buono, US 2003/0057749 in view of Zeile et al., US 5,683,090.

Regarding claim 1, Lambert discloses an apparatus consisting of an LCD (Liquid crystal display) of rectangular contour comprising:

a) An LCD (Liquid crystal display) mounted directly behind the seat of a person (LCD mounted directly behind the seat of a person, Col. 2, lines 30-38)

b) Lambert discloses the LCD screen are attached to the behind of the seats with Velcro adhesive (Col. 2, lines 38-55)

Lambert fails to teach c) receivers provided by a satellite-based company which are installed along with the small dish satellite at a sports stadium enable the specific

televised sports event to be viewed inside the sports arena, d) the receiver transmits a satellite signal to the particular LCD screen via RCA cables which contain input and output on both the LCD screen and receiver, e) the receivers provided by a satellite-based company are positioned under the viewers' seat along with the receiver channel changer attached to the receiver with Velcro connecting the two together and therefore allowing the viewer to select the sports channel broadcast they are attending live, or the game(s) they so choose and that this apparatus can be placed at a sports stadium.

In an analogous art, Haken discloses that a satellite based company provides the receivers (Para. 30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert's apparatus in order to have a satellite based company to provide the receivers, as taught by Haken. This is standard practice in video distribution. Lambert and Haken fail to disclose d) the receiver transmits a satellite signal to the particular LCD screen via RCA cables which contain input and output on both the LCD screen and receiver, e) the receivers provided by a satellite-based company are positioned under the viewers' seat along with the receiver channel changer attached to the receiver with Velcro connecting the two together and therefore allowing the viewer to select the sports channel broadcast they are attending live, or the game(s) they so choose and that this apparatus can be placed at a sports stadium.

In an analogous art, Lewis teaches the use of RCA cables (Para. 80 and 142). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert and Haken's apparatus to include the use of RCA cables, as taught by Lewis.

The motivation would have been to transfer video and audio from the receiver to the LCD screen.

Lambert, Haken, and Lewis fail to teach the said receivers provided by a satellite-based company are positioned under the viewers' seat along with the receiver channel changer attached to the receiver with Velcro connecting the two together and therefore allowing the viewer to select the sports channel broadcast they are attending live, or the game(s) they so choose and that this apparatus can be placed at a sports stadium.

In an analogous art, Buono discloses the placement of electronic equipment under the viewers' seat (figure 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, and Lewis' apparatus to include positioning the equipment under the seat, As taught by Buono. The motivation would have been to have the equipment in a secure location without interfering with the user.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, and Buono fail to teach that the viewing apparatus can be placed at a sports stadium.

In an analogous art, Zeile teaches that a viewing monitor placed inside a sports stadium (Col. 4, lines 14-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, and Buono's apparatus to include placing the apparatus in a sports stadium, as taught by Zeile. The motivation would have been to give the people attending a sports event an opportunity to see highlights or replays of the game, so they will not miss part of the game if they were not paying attention.

Regarding claim 7, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1. Haken further discloses provided with means for installation of small dish satellite being the same standard installation they operate with (Para. 30).

Regarding claim 9, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to teach said seated row sections inside the sports stadium are designated for such apparatus gets the viewers awareness to please not touch the LCD screen with peal-off stickers that read, please don't touch the screen.

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known to use peal off stickers to call the attention of the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include peal off stickers. The motivation would have been to call the attention of the user in order to inform the user about the respective sign.

Regarding claim 10, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to disclose seated row sections inside the sports stadium are designated for such apparatus allow the viewer that attends regular games at the particular sports arena, to purchase a LCD "Game

Viewer's Pass" with advance sales purchase to avoid sell out designated LCD viewing sections.

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known that people buy in advanced to avoid sell out of the specific product or service.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include buying the tickets in advance. The motivation would have been to attend the event.

Regarding claim 11, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 10.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to disclose viewer that attends regular games at the particular sports arena allow the viewer to purchase in advance with their Season tickets pass, with advance tickets sales, through the sports event team website, or by simply buying the advance viewing tickets if they don't want to wait for an available designated section.

The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that it is notoriously well known that people buy in advance if they do not want to wait for an available section.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile's apparatus to include buying the tickets in advance. The motivation would have been to attend the event.

Regarding claim 13, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1. Buono further teaches comprising of audible capabilities from the LCD screen itself or from an outside source such as a mini- speaker(s) (Para. 26, and 35).

Regarding claim 14, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1. Haken further teaches comprising of a satellite-based company, which installs a small satellite dish and receiver(s) towards any television(s) at home or at a business, is the same installation used for the above apparatus (Para. 30).

3. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Salmon Jr., US 2002/0121905.

Regarding claim 2, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus LCD television screen of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to teach wherein the screen is powered by a 12 to 14 AC current.

In an analogous art, Salmon Jr. discloses the use of a 12 volt power supply (Para. 27 and 28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include a 12 volt power supply, as taught by Salmon Jr. The motivation would have been to power the screen in order to give the user the requested program.

Regarding claim 3, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile and Salmon Jr. disclose the apparatus of claim 2. Salmon Jr. further teaches the screen is powered by a 12 to 14 volt AC current is plugged in to an AC circuit breaker that plugs in to another electrical source inside the sports facility (Para. 27 and 28).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile, and Salmon Jr. as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Kocznar et al., US 5,135,095.

Regarding claim 4, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile, and Salmon Jr. disclose the apparatus of claim 3.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile, and Salmon Jr. fail to teach comprising an LCD television screen that is typically from said 5x4xl to 7x6x3, of which has two RCA inputs and outputs that feed the signal from another antenna, cable, or satellite.

In an analogous art, Kocznar teaches the dimensions of the screen (Col. 5, lines 22-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, Zeile, and Salmon's apparatus to include the dimensions, as taught by Kocznar. These are standard dimensions for LCD's that are placed in back of seats.

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gruhl et al., US 2002/0012068.

Regarding claim 5, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to disclose said receiver is available to the consumer only for sports related games that are broadcasted to them in particular via the said small satellite dish that feeds the transmission towards the receiver and then the LCD television screen inside the sports arena.

In an analogous art, Gruhl discloses broadcasting only some categories of programs such as sports (Para. 49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include the broadcasting of sports only, as taught by Gruhl. The motivation would have been to give the users only what they want to watch.

Claim 6 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Heughebaert et al., US 2005/0273814.

Regarding claim 8, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to disclose further provided with operating needs with said viewer and LCD television screen by the viewer already finding the LCD screen on and already broadcasting sports news information, or video feed from the actual game attended in the same stadium therefore allowing the viewer to operate the said apparatus by only changing the sports channel with said channel changer, adjusting the volume, and the brightness control level displayed on the front of the LCD screen.

In an analogous art, Heughebaert discloses an apparatus to change channels, to adjust the volume and brightness (Para. 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include changing channels and adjusting volume and brightness, as taught by Heughebaert. These are standard features of LCD screens for user convenience.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bruch et al., US 2003/0120509.

Regarding claim 15, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to disclose wherein said seated row section inside the sports stadium are designated for such apparatus needs are directly stipulated to the potential viewer of the LCD screens, that they must sign a brief agreement and give identifiable information in order for the viewer to be responsible at the end of the game for the LCD screen in case some intentional damage or stolen property occurs at that particular seat after the game.

In an analogous art, Bruch discloses the use of a contract to ensure proper return of equipment (Para. 33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include the use of a contract in order to ensure proper return of the equipment, as taught by Bruch. The motivation would have been to maintain in good condition the electronic equipment.

8. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Schulze Jr., US 6,233,564.

Regarding claim 12, Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile disclose the apparatus of claim 1.

Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile fail to teach said LCD (Liquid crystal display) of rectangular contour which represents the viewer with prior knowledge of the above service rendered before attending the sports event by either paying at the ticket

office for their designated ticket seated section that renders the above apparatus, or by the company creating awareness of the service apparatus.

In an analogous art, Schulze teaches the use of advertising to let the people know about products and services (Col. 1, lines 10-55).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lambert, Haken, Lewis, Buono, and Zeile's apparatus to include the use of advertisement to let people know about the service before attending the event, as taught by Schulze. The motivation would have been to inform the user what kind of service they are getting before attending the event.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OSCHTA MONTOYA whose telephone number is (571)270-1192. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday/Friday 7:30 to 5:00 off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Grant can be reached on (571) 272-7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OM

/Christopher Grant/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623